

theKNOWLEDGEPolitician

Questioning the water we swim in



Concept-time:

In More Detail

June 2026

© Leslie John Eastman and theKNOWLEDGEPolitic, 2026.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).

You are free to copy, redistribute, adapt, remix, and build upon this material for non-commercial purposes, provided appropriate attribution is given to the original author and source, and any derivative works are distributed under the same licence.

Commercial use of this material without prior written permission is prohibited.

To view a copy of this licence, visit:

[Creative Commons CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 Licence](#)

This work is intended as a living contribution to public knowledge, ethical systems design, and relational practice development. It is released to support collaborative social, ethical, and institutional development consistent with the values of [theKNOWLEDGEPolitic](#).

Introduction

Concept Time is a framework for understanding how individuals, institutions, and societies exist within evolving systems of meaning rather than merely chronological time.

It proposes that people can live in the same historical moment while occupying very different conceptual relationships to reality, depending on the assumptions, values, and systems organising their understanding of the world.

As societies change, older and newer ways of organising relationship, identity, power, knowledge, and belonging coexist simultaneously. This creates tension because different groups are often interpreting reality through different conceptual frameworks rather than simply disagreeing about facts.

Concept Time therefore explains social conflict, transition, and cultural change as the friction produced when multiple systems of meaning overlap during periods of transformation.

At its core, Concept Time asks:

- What kind of world does this system assume?
- What kind of human being does it produce?
- And where are individuals or societies positioned within the evolving arc of meaning itself?

Under the broader doctrine of: **Relationship + Order = System**

...Concept Time becomes a way of understanding how different forms of order shape different relational realities across history.

Transition and the Evolution of Meaning

To locate yourself within an arc, you usually need exposure to at least two different ways of being, because if you have only ever inhabited one system of meaning, it tends to appear as reality itself rather than as *a particular historical arrangement*.

A fish does not notice water until it encounters air.

Concept Time is partly about what becomes visible when a person, generation, or society experiences overlap between systems that organise relationship differently.

For example:

- someone raised partly before and partly after large-scale digital mediation of life,
- someone who has lived in both strong communal structures and highly individualised market systems,
- someone who moves between cultures,
- someone who experiences institutional collapse after believing the institution was stable,
- or someone whose personal suffering forces them outside dominant assumptions,

...often gains the ability to perceive the arc itself.

This is because the transition creates contrast. Without contrast, order feels natural. With contrast, order becomes visible. That visibility is deeply important in your framework because systems are not just technical structures — they are relational realities normalised over time.

So people inside a single dominant frame often mistake:

- historically specific arrangements for universal truths,
- adaptive behaviours for personality,
- institutional logic for morality,
- and current systems for inevitable reality.

But once a person has inhabited more than one relational order, they can begin to perceive that:

- different systems produce different kinds of selves,
- different forms of order create different emotional realities,
- and what feels “natural” is often socially constructed and historically contingent.

This is why transitional generations are often psychologically strained. They are carrying two maps simultaneously.

Part of them still understands the older relational world. Part of them is adapting to the emerging one.

And because of that, they can experience:

- grief,
- alienation,
- fragmentation,
- heightened reflexivity,
- or a sense that “something fundamental has changed.”

But they also often become translators between worlds.

That is why people in transitional concept-time positions are frequently:

- artists,
- reformers,
- philosophers,
- dissidents,
- bridge-builders,
- or people who feel socially “out of sync.”

They are attempting to explain one reality using the language of another.

Under your model, this is not pathology. It is often what consciousness feels like during systemic transition.

Importantly, though, Concept Time probably does not require full participation in two worlds equally. Sometimes indirect exposure is enough.

For example:

- hearing stories from older generations,
- encountering alternative cultures,
- studying history deeply,

- experiencing exclusion from the dominant order,
- or even recognising contradictions within the current system,

...can create enough conceptual distance to perceive movement across the arc.

This also explains why societies often resist transitional thinkers. People anchored firmly inside one dominant frame frequently experience alternate conceptual positions as threatening, incoherent, regressive, or destabilising.

Because if the current order is no longer experienced as inevitable, then the legitimacy of the system itself becomes open to question.

And that is where Concept Time becomes politically important: not merely as a theory of change, but as a theory of why people living in the same historical moment can experience reality so differently.

They are not necessarily occupying different chronological time.

They are occupying different relationships to the evolution of meaning itself.

The Reclamation of the Relational Commons

What makes *Concept Time* powerful is that it does not explain social change primarily through technology, economics, or politics in isolation. It explains change through the movement of human consciousness inside systems. The privatisation of the commons becomes a near-perfect illustration because it shows how societies slowly reorganise relationship itself — often without fully noticing it while it is happening.

At its simplest, the commons were spaces where relationship existed before transaction. A town square, a public library, a park, a local hall, a beach, a church courtyard, a community football ground, a street where children played — these were places where people encountered each other not primarily as consumers, but as members of a shared social reality. The commons represented relational space held collectively. They were imperfect, often exclusionary, but structurally they embodied an idea: that some parts of life belonged to everyone.

Concept Time suggests that societies move through phases in how they understand and organise these relational spaces.

In an earlier concept-time position, the commons are experienced as natural and obvious. People may not even consciously defend them because they feel embedded in reality itself. Relationship precedes market logic. Economic activity exists, but it is held inside broader civic, familial, spiritual, or communal structures. A person can still imagine themselves as belonging somewhere without first proving economic value. Public space functions as a holding environment for collective identity.

As societies move further into market-oriented concept time, however, a subtle shift occurs. The organising principle changes from *shared belonging* to *managed efficiency*. The commons increasingly come to be viewed not as relational infrastructure, but as underutilised assets. Public land becomes “development opportunity.” Libraries become “cost centres.” Public housing becomes “market distortion.” Civic interaction becomes reinterpreted through productivity, liability, optimisation, surveillance, and monetisation.

This is where Concept Time becomes important, because different groups are now living in different conceptual worlds simultaneously.

Those operating in the earlier frame often experience the loss as grief, alienation, or

social fragmentation. They may say things like:

- “People don’t know their neighbours anymore.”
- “Everything feels commercialised.”
- “There’s nowhere to simply exist.”
- “Community has disappeared.”

Meanwhile, those operating in the later frame often interpret the same transformation as rational progress:

- “Unused assets should be activated.”
- “Efficiency creates prosperity.”
- “Private management improves outcomes.”
- “Market competition drives innovation.”

Neither side fully understands the other because they are not simply disagreeing about policy. They are inhabiting different concept-time positions regarding the purpose of social space itself.

Under this framework, privatisation is not merely economic. It is the reordering of relationship through a different logic of order.

This connects to the doctrine of: Relationship + Order = System The question is never whether systems exist. The question is what kind of order is being imposed upon relationship.

The privatisation of the commons represents a historical movement where market order increasingly became the dominant organising principle for human interaction. Spaces once designed to hold relationship became redesigned to extract value. Shopping centres replaced town squares. Subscription replaced membership. Branding replaced local identity. Algorithmic visibility replaced organic gathering. Even digital commons increasingly became enclosed within privately owned platforms where interaction itself became monetised data.

Concept Time helps explain why this process feels normal to some generations and deeply unsettling to others. People born later into highly marketised systems often experience privatised relational life as reality itself. They may struggle to imagine truly public space because they have inherited enclosure as normality. Earlier generations may retain partial memory of relational structures that existed prior to full market saturation. The conflict between these groups is often interpreted politically, but underneath it is a conflict between different temporal positions in social consciousness.

Importantly, Concept Time does not romanticise the past. Earlier commons often excluded many people through race, gender, class, disability, sexuality, or cultural hierarchy. The point is not to return backwards unchanged. Rather, the framework asks whether humanity can move into a new stage where relationship is consciously protected rather than unconsciously dissolved by systems optimised primarily for extraction.

In this sense, the next movement in Concept Time may involve the conscious rebuilding of the commons — not merely as physical places, but as relational infrastructure.

This includes:

- public space,
- shared civic identity,
- digital commons,
- cooperative systems,
- restorative justice,
- universal access structures,
- participatory governance,
- and institutions designed to hold human dignity prior to economic utility.

The deeper claim is that societies eventually encounter the limits of systems organised primarily around abstraction, optimisation, and transactional logic. As relational load increases — loneliness, distrust, polarisation, anxiety, social fragmentation — the system begins consuming the very social fabric it depends upon.

Order unmitigated by relationship eventually destabilises itself.

And this is where Concept Time becomes hopeful rather than merely diagnostic. The fractures themselves become signals. Alienation becomes evidence that something essential is missing. The exhaustion many people feel is not necessarily individual failure, but possibly the psychological experience of living inside systems where relationship has been progressively enclosed, commodified, and thinned.

The future question then becomes: Can humanity consciously rebuild systems where relationship is once again treated as foundational rather than residual?

Because if the commons were originally the shared spaces where society met itself, then the next phase of Concept Time may be about rediscovering how to hold collective life together without reducing every human interaction to transaction, performance, or extraction.

The Evolution of Objectivity and the Wisdom Arc

The information–knowledge–wisdom arc can be understood as a developmental movement in how human beings relate to reality.

At the level of information, reality appears fragmented. At the level of knowledge, fragments begin to organise into patterns. At the level of wisdom, those patterns are reintegrated into lived relationship.

Concept Time helps explain not only how individuals move through these stages, but how entire societies can become anchored predominantly within one layer of the arc.

Under this framework, information is not yet understanding. Information is raw signal — observations, data, symbols, measurements, events, categories, stories, statistics, memories, images. Information is accumulation. Modern technological societies have become extraordinarily effective at producing it. Never before has humanity possessed such vast informational capacity.

But information alone does not tell us what matters, how things relate, or what should be done.

Knowledge emerges when information becomes organised into structure. Human

beings begin identifying relationships between pieces of information. Patterns appear. Models form. Cause and effect become visible. Systems become legible. Knowledge therefore depends upon interpretation. It requires frameworks capable of holding complexity long enough for meaning to emerge.

This is why knowledge is always shaped by perspective. The same informational field can produce radically different forms of knowledge depending on the assumptions organising interpretation.

For example:

- one society may interpret addiction primarily through criminality,
- another through trauma,
- another through neurobiology,
- another through economics,
- another through spiritual crisis.

The information may overlap. The organising framework differs.

Wisdom emerges when knowledge becomes integrated with relational understanding, ethical orientation, humility, and lived consequence. Wisdom recognises not only patterns, but the limits of patterns. It understands that systems affect people differently depending on history, context, power, vulnerability, culture, timing, and relationship. Wisdom therefore resists reducing reality entirely into abstraction. This becomes extremely important in contemporary societies because modern systems often privilege information and technical knowledge while underdeveloping wisdom.

A system optimised around speed, efficiency, metrics, prediction, and scalability tends to reward:

- data accumulation,
- categorisation,
- procedural certainty,
- and technical optimisation.

But wisdom frequently requires the opposite conditions:

- slowness,
- reflection,
- ambiguity tolerance,
- relational presence,
- historical memory,
- and ethical restraint.

Concept Time helps explain why this imbalance emerges historically.

In earlier concept-time positions, knowledge and wisdom were often fused within communal, spiritual, or intergenerational structures. Understanding was embedded in lived social continuity. A person learned not only facts, but how to inhabit a moral and relational world. However, those systems could also become rigid, exclusionary, anti-scientific, or oppressive because inherited wisdom was difficult to challenge.

Modernity disrupted those structures and dramatically expanded humanity's

informational and analytical capacities. Scientific objectivity, empirical inquiry, liberal rights, technological systems, and institutional rationality allowed extraordinary advances. Human beings increasingly learned to separate observation from tradition, measurement from myth, and evidence from authority.

This development was enormously important.

But Concept Time suggests that modern societies sometimes mistake this transitional achievement for final objectivity itself.

Under this framework, objectivity is not the absence of perspective. Rather, it is a disciplined attempt to reduce distortion within a particular conceptual frame.

Every observer still stands somewhere.

The categories we use, the questions we ask, the variables we measure, the things we exclude, and the systems we prioritise are all shaped by historical and conceptual conditions. Even highly rigorous science operates within paradigms that organise attention in specific ways.

Concept Time therefore reframes objectivity not as a view from nowhere, but as an evolving relationship between observer, system, and reality.

At earlier stages of understanding, people may assume:

- “my interpretation is reality.”

At more developed stages, people begin recognising:

- “my interpretation is shaped by the system of meaning I inhabit.”

At still deeper levels, people recognise:

- “all systems reveal some truths while obscuring others.”

This does not collapse into relativism. Concept Time does not argue that all claims are equally true. Some models clearly correspond to reality better than others. Some systems produce less harm. Some interpretations are more empirically rigorous. Some structures better preserve dignity and human flourishing.

But the framework argues that objectivity itself evolves.

For example, many practices once regarded as objective:

- racial hierarchies,
- institutionalisation,
- punitive child-rearing,
- criminalisation of mental illness,
- exclusion of women from knowledge systems,
- pathologising homosexuality,
- colonial “civilising” missions,

...were often experienced by their societies as rational, evidence-based, and objective within the dominant conceptual order of their time.

What changed was not merely new information. What changed was the conceptual framework organising interpretation.

New relational realities became visible.

This is why Concept Time places such importance on transitional consciousness. Individuals exposed to multiple systems of meaning often become more capable of perceiving the limits of their own frameworks. Encountering another way of organising life creates conceptual distance. The observer begins seeing not only the world, but the lens through which the world is being interpreted.

This produces a more reflexive form of objectivity.

Not: "I am fully objective." But: "I recognise that my perception emerges within historical, relational, institutional, and conceptual conditions."

Paradoxically, this can produce greater epistemic humility while also strengthening truth-seeking. A person becomes less attached to defending total certainty and more capable of remaining open to revision without collapsing into nihilism.

Under the doctrine: **Relationship + Order = System** objectivity itself becomes relationally situated.

A system orders reality in particular ways.

That ordering determines:

- what counts as evidence,
- what becomes visible,
- what remains invisible,
- who is authorised to speak,
- whose suffering is legible,
- and which forms of knowledge are legitimised.

Concept Time therefore explains why societies often move through recurring cycles:

1. A framework emerges that increases explanatory power.
2. The framework becomes institutionalised.
3. The framework eventually overextends and begins obscuring realities it cannot easily account for.
4. Contradictions accumulate.
5. Transitional thinkers begin perceiving the limits of the dominant frame.
6. A new synthesis slowly emerges.

This movement is not linear progress toward perfection. Every conceptual system reveals and conceals simultaneously.

Wisdom, then, may ultimately involve the capacity to hold this tension consciously:

- to pursue truth rigorously,
- to value objectivity deeply,
- while also recognising the historical situatedness of all human knowledge systems.

In this sense, wisdom is not the abandonment of objectivity. It is the maturation of it.

Because the wisest forms of understanding do not merely accumulate information or defend models. They remain relationally open to reality itself — including the possibility that reality is always larger than the systems we build to contain it.

Consciousness and the Architecture of Human Meaning

Concept Time begins with a simple observation: Human beings do not merely live in chronological time. They also live inside systems of meaning.

A society is not only made up of laws, technologies, economies, or institutions. It is made up of shared assumptions about what is normal, what is valuable, what is possible, and what it means to be a person in relation to others. These assumptions shape how people organise relationship, power, work, identity, freedom, morality, and belonging. Over long periods, these assumptions change. But they do not change all at once, and they do not change evenly.

Concept Time is an attempt to describe what it feels like when multiple systems of meaning exist simultaneously during periods of transition.

Under this framework, historical movement is not simply the replacement of one era by another. Rather, societies become layered. Older forms of understanding continue to exist while newer ones emerge. Different people, institutions, and generations therefore occupy different positions along an evolving conceptual arc. They may inhabit the same physical world while interpreting reality through entirely different organising assumptions.

This is why periods of rapid social transformation often feel confusing, conflictual, or psychologically destabilising. The conflict is not always about facts alone. It is often about fundamentally different understandings of what reality itself is for.

A person strongly anchored in one conceptual position may experience another position as irrational, threatening, immoral, naive, or incoherent. Yet both are often acting logically according to the internal assumptions of the world they inhabit.

Concept Time therefore proposes that many contemporary conflicts are not simply political disagreements, but collisions between different temporal relationships to meaning itself.

For much of human history, people inherited relatively stable relational structures. Family, religion, community, labour, geography, and civic identity often formed relatively coherent systems of belonging. Individuals understood themselves primarily through their place within these structures. Meaning was externally held and socially reinforced. In these environments, the system often appeared natural and eternal because few people encountered fundamentally different ways of organising life.

But as societies modernised, industrialised, globalised, digitised, and marketised, those structures began to loosen. Individuals increasingly encountered multiple competing frameworks simultaneously. Tradition weakened. Geographic continuity fractured. Work became mobile. Identity became fluid. Public life became mediated through mass media and later through algorithmic systems. The commons — places

where people once gathered primarily as citizens, neighbours, or participants in shared civic life — increasingly became privatised, monetised, or digitally enclosed. As this occurred, the dominant organising principle of many societies shifted. Relationship gradually became reorganised through systems optimised for efficiency, transaction, visibility, extraction, and scalability. Human beings increasingly encountered each other not through shared relational structures, but through market systems, institutional systems, or digital systems.

Importantly, Concept Time does not frame this as a simple story of decline. Modernity produced extraordinary freedoms, protections, scientific advances, and expansions of individual rights. Many older systems were oppressive, exclusionary, and rigid. The point is not nostalgia. The point is that every system produces a different type of self.

As systems change, so too does consciousness.

People born into highly marketised and digitised environments may experience transactional life as normal because it is the only order they have ever known. Others who lived partially before these transitions may experience the same world as fragmented, alienating, or relationally thin. Transitional generations often carry both realities simultaneously. They remember one form of social life while adapting to another. Because of this, they are often able to perceive the movement of the arc itself.

This is one of the central ideas within Concept Time:
you usually need some encounter with more than one way of being in order to perceive that systems are historically contingent rather than inevitable.

Without contrast, systems disappear into normality.

A person who has only ever known one dominant order often experiences that order as reality itself. But once someone encounters another mode of organising relationship — through history, migration, trauma, exclusion, education, art, social change, or intergenerational memory — the constructed nature of systems begins to reveal itself.

At this point, consciousness changes.

The person begins to recognise that:

- behaviours once treated as individual may be adaptive responses to systems,
- institutions may reflect historical arrangements rather than eternal truths,
- identities may be shaped by relational conditions,
- and social suffering may emerge not only from personal failure, but from systemic contradiction.

This transition is often psychologically difficult because it destabilises certainty. A person between conceptual worlds can feel dislocated, fragmented, or socially out of sync. They may struggle to fully belong to either the older order or the emerging one. Yet these transitional positions are also where many artists, reformers, philosophers, and bridge-builders emerge. They become translators between worlds because they can perceive multiple conceptual realities simultaneously.

Under the broader doctrine of:

Relationship + Order = System

Concept Time becomes a way of understanding how systems evolve according to the forms of order imposed upon relationship.

Relationship is primary. Human beings are relational creatures before they are economic actors, institutional subjects, or political identities. Order gives relationship structure, and that structure becomes system. But systems differ according to the logic organising them.

Some systems organise relationship primarily through kinship.

Some through religion.

Some through state authority.

Some through market logic.

Some through digital visibility.

Some through collective care.

Some through surveillance and risk management.

Each produces different emotional realities, different identities, and different understandings of freedom.

Concept Time therefore asks not only:

“What system are we in?”

But also:

“What kind of human being does this system produce?”

“What forms of relationship does it protect?”

“What forms does it dissolve?”

“And what happens when large numbers of people can no longer emotionally survive the systems they are being asked to inhabit?”

This is why contemporary societies often experience rising loneliness, polarisation, anxiety, distrust, and exhaustion despite unprecedented technological advancement. The issue may not simply be individual pathology. It may reflect the relational consequences of systems increasingly optimised around abstraction, performance, transaction, and scale rather than durable human connection.

Concept Time does not predict a final destination. It is not a deterministic theory of progress. Rather, it is a framework for understanding that societies are always moving through evolving relationships to meaning, and that people experience those movements unevenly.

Some defend the current order because it still provides coherence.

Some seek restoration of older forms.

Some attempt to build new structures entirely.

Some withdraw.

Some fragment.

Some integrate.

And increasingly, many people seem to sense that the current moment represents a threshold — a period where older organising systems no longer fully hold, while new relational structures have not yet cohered.

In this sense, Concept Time is ultimately about consciousness during transition. It is about what happens when human beings begin to realise that the systems surrounding them are neither natural nor permanent, but historical arrangements shaped by particular forms of order imposed upon relationship.

And once that becomes visible, the future opens again

